

China Patent & Trademark
Agent (U.S.A.) LTD.
55 Broad Street, 15th Floor,
New York, NY 10004, U.S.A.
Tel: (1-212)8098100

Tokyo Office
Room 1003, Bureau Toranomon
2-7-16 Toranomon Minato-ku,
Tokyo 105-0001, Japan
Tel: (81-3)52511966

CHINA PATENT AGENT (H.K.) LTD.

中国专利代理 (香港) 有限公司

Patent, Trademark, Copyright & Legal Affairs

22/F., GREAT EAGLE CENTRE,
23 HARBOUR ROAD, WANCHAI, HONG KONG.

TEL.: (852)28284688 FAX: (852)28271018

Please reply to Hong Kong office

Munich Office
Zweibrueckenstrasse 17,
D-80331 Munich, Germany
Tel: (49-89)2289328

Beijing Office
B-19/F., Investment Plaza,
27 Jinrong Street
Xicheng District
Beijing 100032, China.
Tel.: (86-10) 66211588

NOKIA IPR DEPARTMENT
NOKIA HOUSE
SUMMIT AVENUE FARNBOROUGH
HAMPSHIRE GU14 0NG
UNITED KINGDOM

Attn.: MR. EAN DAVIES

☐ COMP RECORD

☐ FILE RECORD

☐ DIARY

19 FEB 2004

☐ RENEWAL RECORD

☐ CITATIONS

☐ INV AWARD

☐ LETTERS
☐ CC

Fax No: 44-1252865080

Date: February 14, 2004

(IP7241)

Re: Chinese Patent Application for Invention No. 01143784.7

In the name of NOKIA CORPORATION.

Title: A CONNECTOR

Your Ref: PAT00037CN(NC33507)

Our Ref: CPME0142640

CONFIRMATION

Dear Mr. Davies,

Enclosed for your review are a First Office Action issued on the subject patent application on January 16, 2004 and an English translation thereof, together with a copy of the reference cited by the examiner. A response is due on or before May 31, 2004, readily extendable up to July 31, 2004 upon request and payment of extension fees.

Turning to the Office Action, the examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7-9 and 11 under Article 22(2) of the Chinese Patent Law as lacking novelty over CN1250535A. He alleges that the reference has disclosed all the technical elements of the invention. The examiner has also rejected claims 3, 5 and 10 under Article 22(3) of the Chinese Patent Law as lacking inventiveness over this reference. To traverse the examiner's grounds of rejection, we would appreciate receiving your comments as to the differences between the invention and the prior art, and any advantages attributable to the differences. For your reference, Article 22(2) and 22(3) of the Chinese Patent Law reads as follows,

"Novelty means that, before the date of filing, no identical invention...has been publicly disclosed in publications in the country or abroad or has been publicly used or made known to the public by any other means in the country, nor has any other person filed previously with the Patent Office an application which described the identical invention...and was published after the said date of filing."

"Inventiveness means that, as compared with the technology existing before the date of filing, the invention has prominent substantive features and represents a notable progress...."

In addition, the examiner has objected to claims 12 and 13 as being obscure. He alleges that the features recited in claims 12 and 13 are functional statements and should be substituted by specific structural features for fulfilling such functions. Your comments in this respect or instructions on how to amend claims 12 and 13 would be highly appreciated.

Claims 4-6, 8-12 and 14 are objected to for multiple dependencies. After reviewing the file, we recommend amending claims 4-6, 8-12 and 14 to depend from claim 1 or 2.

The examiner has also objected to claim 17 as being unclear. As the Chinese Patent Office does not accept omnibus claims, we propose to delete this claim.

By the way, we note that the CN1250535A is the corresponding Chinese application of WO9841946. Anyway, if you need a translation of this reference, please let us know as soon as possible.

Please review the Action and the reference, and provide us with your comments and instructions well before the due date.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact us.

Very truly yours,


Zheng Jianhui

Encl.

Patent Office of the People's Republic of China

Address : Receiving Section of the Chinese Patent Office, No. 6 Tucheng Road West, Haidian District, Beijing, Postal code: 100088

Applicant	NOKIA CORPORATION			Seal of Examiner	Date of Issue
Agent	China Patent Agent (H.K.) Ltd.				January 16, 2004
Patent Application No.	01143784.7	Application Date	December 21, 2001	Exam Dept.	
Title of Invention	A CONNECTOR				

First Office Action

1. ☒ Pursuant to the provision of Article 35 (1) of the Chinese Patent Law, the examiner made an examination as to substance of the captioned patent application for invention upon the request for substantive examination filed by the applicant.

☐ Pursuant to the provision of Article 35 (2) of the Chinese Patent Law, the Chinese Patent Office has decided to conduct on its own initiative an examination as to substance of the captioned patent application for invention.

2. ☒ The applicant requests taking the filing date, December 21, 2000, at the GB Patent Office, the filing date, _____, at the _____ Patent Office, the filing date, _____, at the _____ Patent Office as the priority date of the present application.

☒ A copy of the first filed patent application certified by the receiving organ of the initial country of filing has been submitted by the applicant.

☐ A copy of the first filed patent application certified by the receiving organ of the initial country of filing has not been submitted by the applicant. Pursuant to the provision of Article 30 of the Chinese Patent Law, no priority right shall be deemed to have been claimed.

3. ☐ The applicant filed amended application document(s) on _____ and _____.

☐ Examination has confirmed that _____ filed on _____ cannot be accepted, _____ filed on _____ cannot be accepted,

as the above amendment(s) ☐ is/are not in conformity with the provision of Article 33 of the Chinese Patent Law.

☐ is/are not in conformity with the provision of Rule 51 of the Implementing Regulations of the Chinese Patent Law.

☐ For the specific reason that the amendment(s) cannot be accepted, see the text of the Office Action.

4. ☒ The examination is conducted in the light of the original application document(s)
☐ The examination is conducted in the light of the following application document(s):
in the original application documents submitted on the filing date:
Claim(s) _____, page(s) _____ of the description, Figure(s)
of the drawing(s); Claim(s) _____, page(s) _____ of the description,
Figure(s) _____ submitted on _____; Claim(s) _____, page (s)
of the description, Figure(s) _____ submitted on _____
☐ Abstract of the description submitted on _____.
5. ☐ The present Office Action has been prepared without a search having been conducted.
☒ The present Office Action has been prepared with a search having been conducted.
☒ The following reference document(s) is/are cited in this Office Action (its/their serial number(s) will, continue to be used throughout the examination procedure):

No.	Number or Title of Document	Date of Publication (or filing date of interfering application)
1	CN1250535A	April 12, 2000
2		(Date)
3		(Date)
4		
5		
6		

6. The concluding comments of the examiner are:

- ☐ On the description:
- ☐ The content of the application comes within the scope where no patent right is granted as provided in Article 5 of the Patent Law.
 - ☐ The description is not in conformity with the provision of Article 26(3) of the Patent Law.
 - ☐ The drafting of the description is not in conformity with the provision of Rule 18 of the Implementing Regulations.
- ☒ On the claims:
- ☐ Claim comes within the scope where no patent right is granted as provided in Article 25 of the Patent Law.
 - ☐ Claim is not in conformity with the definition of invention in Rule 2(1) of the Implementing Regulations.
 - ☒ Claim 1, 2, 4, 6, 7-9, 11 does not possess novelty as provided in Article 22(2) of the Patent Law.
 - ☒ Claim 3, 5, 10 does not possess inventiveness as provided in Article 22(3) of the Patent Law.
 - ☐ Claim _____ does not possess practical applicability as provided in Article 22(4) of the Patent Law.
 - ☐ Claim _____ is not in conformity with the provision of Article 26(4) of the Patent

Law.

- ☐ Claim _____ is not in conformity with the provision of Article 31(1) of the Patent Law.
- ☒ Claim 12-17 is not in conformity with the provisions of Rules 20-23 of the Implementing Regulations.
- ☐ Claim _____ is not in conformity with the provision of Article 9 of the Patent Law.
- ☐ Claim _____ is not in conformity of the provision of Rule 12(1) of the Implementing Regulations.

For specific analyses of the above concluding comments, see the text of this Office Action.

7. In view of the above concluding comments, the examiner holds that:

- ☐ The applicant should amend the application document in accordance with the requirements raised in the text of this Office Action. The amended document(s) should be submitted in duplicate and should conform to the provisions of Article 33 of the Patent Law and Rule 51 of the Implementing Regulations of the Chinese Patent Law.
- ☒ The applicant should expound in his Observations the reasons why the captioned patent application is patentable and amend the places not conforming to regulations as pointed out in the text of the Office Action, otherwise it would be impossible for the patent right to be granted.
- ☐ The captioned patent application contains no substantive content for which the patent right may be granted, thus if the applicant has not advanced his reasons or has not done so adequately, the application will be rejected.

8. The applicant should pay attention to the following matters:

- (1) In accordance with the provision of Article 37 of the Patent Law, the applicant should submit his/its Observations within **four** months from the date of receipt of this Office Action; if, without any justified reason, the time limit for making response is not met, the application will be deemed to have been withdrawn.
- (2) The amendments made by the applicant to his application should conform to the provision of Article 33 of the Patent Law, the amended text should be in duplicate and the format should conform to the relevant provisions of the Guidelines for Examination.
- (3) The applicant's Observations or amended text should be mailed or presented to the Receiving Section of the Chinese Patent Office. Document no mailed or presented to the Acceptance Section have no legal force.
- (4) Without making an appointment, the applicant and/or agent may not come to the Chinese Patent Office to hold an interview with the examiner.

9. This Office Action consists of the text portion totalling three page(s) and of the following annex(es):

- ☐ _____ duplicate copies of the reference document(s) cited totalling page(s).
- ☐
- ☐

Your Ref: PAT00037CN (NC33507)

Our Ref: CPME 0142640

Text of the First Office Action

As stated in the description, the present application relates to a connector. Upon examination, the Examiner's comments are hereby made as follows:

1. Claim 1 claims an electrical connector for connection to a mating connector. Reference document 1 (CN1250535A) has disclosed a card reader connector having resilient electric brush contact and, in particular, the following technical features: a sheet of electrical insulating material (see line 2, page 3 of the description and Fig.1, reference sign 3, equivalent to substrate supporting a contact in claim 1); and electric brush contacts (see line 3, page 3 of the description and Fig.1, reference sign 2, equivalent to the contact in claim 1), wherein the contacts are resilient metal (see lines 4 and 14, page 3 of the description and Fig.1) having a first end protruding from a notch. Thus, it can be seen that said reference document has disclosed all the technical features of said claim. Besides, the technical solution disclosed in said reference document and that claimed in said claim are of the same technical field and capable of producing the same technical effect. Therefore, the technical solution claimed in claim1 does not possess any novelty, so said claim is contrary to the provision of Article 22, para. two, of the Patent Law.

2. The additional technical feature of dependent claim 2 has also been disclosed in reference document 1 (see line 4, page 3 of the description and Fig.1). Therefore, said claim does not possess any novelty as provided for in Article 22, para. two, of the Patent Law.

3. The additional technical feature of dependent claim 3 is of the publicly known

knowledge in the art and is obvious to those skilled in the art. Therefore, said claim does not possess any prominent substantive features, nor represent a notable progress, so said claim does not possess any inventiveness as provided in Article 22, para. three, of the Patent Law.

4. The additional technical feature of dependent claim 4 has also been disclosed in reference document 1 (see line 14, page 3 of the description and Fig.1). Therefore, said claim does not possess any novelty as provided for in Article 22, para. two, of the Patent Law.

5. The additional technical feature of dependent claim 5 is of the publicly known knowledge in the art and is obvious to those skilled in the art. Therefore, said claim does not possess any prominent substantive features, nor represent a notable progress, so said claim does not possess any inventiveness as provided in Article 22, para. three, of the Patent Law.

6. The additional technical features of dependent claims 6, 7 and 8 have also been disclosed in reference document 1 (see lines 6-7, page 3 of the description and Fig.1). Therefore, said claims do not possess any novelty as provided for in Article 22, para. two, of the Patent Law.

7. The additional technical feature of dependent claim 9 has also been disclosed in reference document 1 (see lines 4-5, page 3 of the description and Figs.6 and 7, reference sign 5, equivalent to the means in claim 9). Therefore, said claim does not possess any novelty as provided for in Article 22, para. two, of the Patent Law.

8. The additional technical feature of dependent claim 10 is of the publicly known knowledge in the art and is obvious to those skilled in the art. Therefore, said claim does not possess any prominent substantive features, nor represent a notable progress, so said claim does not possess any inventiveness as provided in Article 22,

para. three, of the Patent Law.

9. The additional technical feature of dependent claim 11 has also been disclosed in reference document 1 (see line 3, page 3 of the description and Fig.1, reference sign 2, equivalent to the means in claim 9). Therefore, said claim does not possess any novelty as provided for in Article 22, para. two, of the Patent Law.

10. Claim 12 fails to state the specific structural features of the connector that supports a contact on each of two opposing surfaces of the substrate. It is impossible for the Examiner to obtain the structure of the connector from said claim. Thus, the scope of protection of said claim has been rendered unclear. Therefore, said claim is contrary to the provision of Rule 20, para. one, of the Implementing Regulations of the Patent Law.

11. Claim 13 fails to state the specific structural features of the connector that is arranged to make contact with two mating parts arranged on opposing sides of the substrate. It is impossible for the Examiner to obtain the structure of the connector from said claim. Thus, the scope of protection of said claim has been rendered unclear. Therefore, said claim is contrary to the provision of Rule 20, para. one, of the Implementing Regulations of the Patent Law.

12. In addition, dependent claims 12-16, multiple dependent claims per se, refer to the preceding multiple dependent claims 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10 and 11. Therefore, said claims are contrary to the provision of Rule 23, para. two, of the Implementing Regulations of the Patent Law. The applicant should make amendments to the dependencies of said claims.

13. Claim 17 contains reference to the accompanying drawings, which is contrary to the provision of Rule 20, para. three, of Implementing Regulations of the Patent Law. The applicant should delete said claim therefrom.

The applicant should make a reply to matter raised herein within the time limit for response prescribed herein and make amendments to the application documents when necessary; otherwise, it will be impossible for the present application to be granted the patent right. The amendments to the application documents should comply with the provisions of Article 33 of the Patent Law and may not go beyond the scope of disclosure contained in the original description and claims.